

Application No. 10/595,989
Amdt. Dated: June 11, 2010
Reply to Office Action Dated: March 26, 2010

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1. This sheet, which respectively includes Fig. 1, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 1. In Fig. 1, reference numbers have been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet
Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the Office Action mailed March 26, 2010. The status of the application is as follows:

- Claims 1 and 3-21 are pending, claims 1, 4-9, 11 and 17 have been amended, claim 2 has been canceled, and claims 20 and 21 have been added;
- The drawings are objected to for informalities;
- The specification is objected to for informalities;
- Claims 1-18 are objected to for informalities;
- Claims 2, 4-7, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph;
- Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kleinman (US 4,597,094);
- Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mahnken et al. (Detection of Colanary Calcifications: Feasibility of Dose Reduction with a Body Weight-Adaptation Examination Protocol: August 2003; AJR; 181: 533-538);
- Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 11, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahnken et al. in view of Born et al. (US 5,349,625);
- Claims 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahnken et al. in view of Born et al. and in further view of Hu et al. (US 6233,304); and
- Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahnken et al. in view of Born et al. and Hu et al. and in further view of Arnold et al. (US 4,922,915).

The objections and rejections are discussed below.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claims 5 and 19 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim(s). The Examiner is also thanked for indicating that claim 12 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim(s).

Claim 5 has been rewritten as independent claim 20 to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and to include aspects of its base claim and the intervening claims. Entry and

allowance of claim 20 (and new claim 21, which depends therefrom) is respectfully requested. Applicant reserves the right to re-write claims 12 and 19 as indicated by the Examiner at a later time, if desired.

The Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner objects to the drawings for missing a reference numeral. This objection should be withdrawn in light of the replacement sheet including Figure 1 in which the missing reference numeral noted by the Office has been added. In addition, another missing reference numeral has been added, and a reference numeral typographical error has been corrected.

The Objection to the Specification

The specification is objected to for informalities. In particular, the Office notes two reference numeral typographical errors. This objection should be withdrawn as the typographical errors have been corrected herein as suggested by the Office.

The Objection to Claims 1-18

Claims 1-18 are objected to for informalities. The objection to these claims should be withdrawn as the subject claims have been amended to obviate the informalities.

The Rejection of Claims 2, 4-7 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 2, 4-7, and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Office notes several instances of lack antecedent basis. This rejection should be withdrawn as the subject claims have been amended to cure the noted lack of antecedent basis.

The Rejection of Claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended herein to incorporate subject matter deemed allowable by the Office. Applicant believes the amendments place claims 1 and 8 in condition of

allowance. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of claims 1 and 8.

The Rejection of Claims 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claim 8 has been amended herein to include aspects of subject matter deemed allowable by the Office. As such, the rejection of claim 8 and claim 10, which depends therefrom, should be withdrawn, and claims 8 and 10 should be allowed.

The Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 11, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 1 has been amended herein to include subject matter deemed allowable by the Office. Thus, this rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn. Claim 2 has been cancelled herein, rendering the rejection thereto moot. Claims 3, 4, 6, 15 and 16 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies, and the rejection thereto should be withdrawn. Claims 9 and 11 depend from independent claim 8, which has been amended herein to include allowable subject matter. Therefore, claims 9 and 11 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies, and the rejection thereto should be withdrawn.

The Rejection of Claims 7 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The subject claims indirectly depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable at by virtue of their dependencies. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

The Rejection of Claims 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 18 indirectly depends from independent claim 1 and is allowable at by virtue of this dependency. Hence, this rejection should be withdrawn.

New Claims 20 and 21

Newly added claim 20 includes subject matter deemed allowable by the Office. Therefore, entry and allowance of this claim is respectfully requested. New claim 21 depends from claim 20 and is allowable at least by virtue of this dependency. No new matter has been added.

Application No. 10/595,989
Amdt. Dated: June 11, 2010
Reply to Office Action Dated: March 26, 2010

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims distinguish patentably and non-obviously over the prior art of record. An early indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony M. Del Zoppo, III Reg. No. 51,606
Driggs, Hogg, Daugherty & Del Zoppo Co., L.P.A.
38500 Chardon Road
Willoughby Hills, Ohio 44094
Phone: 1.440.391.5100
Fax: 1.440.391.5101

Direct all correspondence to:
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
Customer Number: 38107